

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated January 3, 2008 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephone interview conducted on April 2, 2008.

Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-18, and 20 are rejected by the Examiner. With this response, claims 1, 9, and 15 are hereby amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-18, and 20 remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 7, 9-11, 13, 15, 16, 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' Related Art (ARA), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,764,207 to Maekawa et al. ("Maekawa"); claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ARA in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,598,180 to Suzuki et al. ("Suzuki"), and further in view of Maekawa. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

The rejection of claims 1-5, 7, 9-11, 13, 15, 16, 18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ARA in view of Maekawa is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a liquid crystal display device having a combination of features including, for example, "a LCD panel driver, wherein effective pixel signals are each applicable to a corresponding one of each of the data lines during a data apply period and wherein dummy pixel signals are each applicable to a corresponding one of each of the data lines during a blanking period following the data apply period, wherein the dummy pixel signals applicable to adjacent ones of the data lines have voltage levels identical to each other and have polarities different from each other, during the blanking period of every frame." The Office Action acknowledges that ARA does not teach or suggest an LCD panel driver "applying dummy pixel signals during the blanking period" and relies on Maekawa to cure the deficiencies in the teachings of ARA. See Official Action, page 3.

As discussed during the interview of April 2, 2008, Maekawa discloses applying potentials Vp1 and Vp2 but does not teach or suggest that Vp1 and Vp2 have the same magnitude. Accordingly, Applicants submit that ARA and Maekawa, analyzed singly or in

combination do not teach or suggest all of the combined features of claim 1 for at least this reason.

Further, Maekawa discloses the blanking period included in each horizontal period. Accordingly, Applicants submit that ARA and Maekawa, analyzed singly or in combination do not teach or suggest the combined features of claim 1 for at least this additional reason.

Applicants submit that claims 2-5 and 7-8, which depend from claim 1, are allowable over the cited references at least because of their dependencies and for the reasons given for claim 1.

Claim 9 recites a driving method of a liquid crystal display device having a combination of features including, for example, "wherein the dummy pixel signals applied to the data lines have substantially the same voltage level wherein the dummy pixel signals applied to adjacent ones of the data lines have different polarities, and wherein the dummy pixel signals are applied to the data lines during the blanking period of every frame." For reasons similar to those given above for claim 1, Applicants submit that ARA and Maekawa, analyzed singly or in combination do not teach or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 9. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9 and claims 10-11 and 13-14, which depend therefrom, are allowable over ARA and Maekawa.

Claim 15 recites a combination of features including, for example, "wherein the dummy pixel signals applied to the data lines have voltages identical to each other and wherein the polarity of the dummy pixel signals applied to adjacent ones of the data lines have polarities." For reasons similar to those given above for claim 1, Applicants submit that ARA and Maekawa, analyzed singly or in combination do not teach or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 15. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 15 and claims 16-18 and 20, which depend therefrom, are allowable over ARA and Maekawa.

The rejection of claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ARA in view of Suzuki, and further in view of Maekawa is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 recites a liquid crystal display device having a combination of features including, for example, "a LCD panel driver, wherein effective pixel signals are each applicable to a

corresponding one of each of the data lines during a data apply period and wherein dummy pixel signals are each applicable to a corresponding one of each of the data lines during a blanking period following the data apply period, wherein the dummy pixel signals applicable to adjacent ones of the data lines have voltage levels identical to each other and have polarities different from each other, during the blanking period of every frame.”

In rejecting the claims, the Office Action cites Suzuki as teaching “a control circuit inputting white-level signal (i.e., the claimed dummy pixel signal) to signal line drive control circuit. See Office Action page 5 last sentence. Even accepting this conclusion from the Office Action as correct, Suzuki indicates applying the “white-level signal” in “in the case of a normal white display.” See Suzuki, col. 8, lines 21-23. As a zero level will result in displaying white in a normally white display, Applicants submit that Suzuki does not teach or suggest “wherein the dummy pixel signals applicable to adjacent ones of the data lines have voltage levels identical to each other and have polarities different from each other, during the blanking period of every frame” as recited by claim 1. As discussed above, Maekawa similar fails in teaching this combination of features of claim 1. Applicants submit that ARA, Suzuki, and Maekawa, analyzed singly or in any combination, fail to teach or suggest the combined features of claim 1 and that accordingly, claim 1 and claims 2-5, 7, and 8 are each allowable over ARA, Suzuki, and Maekawa.

Claim 9 recites a driving method of a liquid crystal display device having a combination of features including, for example, “wherein the dummy pixel signals applied to the data lines have substantially the same voltage level wherein the dummy pixel signals applied to adjacent ones of the data lines have different polarities, and wherein the dummy pixel signals are applied to the data lines during the blanking period of every frame.” Claim 15 recites a combination of features including, for example, “wherein the dummy pixel signals applied to the data lines have voltages identical to each other and wherein the polarity of the dummy pixel signals applied to adjacent ones of the data lines have polarities.

For reasons similar to those given above for claim 1, Applicants submit that ARA, Suzuki, and Maekawa, analyzed singly or in any combination do not teach or suggest the combination of features recited in claims 9 and 15. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit

that claim 9 and claims 10, 11, 13, and 14 depending therefrom, and claim 15 and claims 16-18 and 20, which depend from claim 15, are allowable over ARA, Suzuki, and Maekawa.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: May 5, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53.005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicants